

Serial No. 09/123,145

-6-

Docket No. 1232-4458

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 43-46, 56 and 57 are currently pending in the application. Of these, claims 43, 56 and 57 are independent. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Moreover, these amendments involve changes suggested by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant asserts that these changes raise no new issues. Accordingly, entry and consideration of this Amendment and Remarks are respectfully requested.

**II. Examiner Interview**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting an interview with the undersigned on January 5, 2006. During this interview, the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 was discussed. In particular, arguments, as set forth below, were presented to the Examiner. In addition, the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 were discussed. Regarding this rejection, the Examiner expressed that the above amendment to claim 57 would overcome this rejection.

**III. Response to Claim Objections:**

Claims 43, 56 and 57 are objected to because of the informalities. Applicants have amended these claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are respectfully requested.

**IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 57 is rejected under 35 USC § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As amended, claim 57 is directed to a computer readable medium. Applicant asserts that this is statutory subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**V. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 43-45, 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,521,719 to Yamada ("Yamada") in view of U.S. Patent No.

67408 v1

Serial No. 09/123,145

-7-

Docket No. 1232-4458

5,442,686 to Wada et al. ("Wada"), and further in view of *The Multimedia Fax-MIME Gateway* by Patel et al. ("Patel"). Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 43, 56, and 57 each recite conversion features. For instance, claim 43 recites "converting the received facsimile image data into an image file, and converting the image file and text data of reception result including the telephone number of the transmitting source and the reception date of the facsimile image data recognized by said recognition step into e-mail data in which the image file is one part and the text data of reception result is another part under MIME format."

The Examiner recognizes at pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action that Yamada and Wada both fail to disclose such conversion features. However, the Examiner asserts that newly cited Patel discloses such conversion features of the claimed invention.

Patel discloses (e.g., in Figs. 2 and 4) that a Workstation transmits e-mail data in MIME format to a Traditional fax via a Gateway. The Gateway converts the e-mail data in MIME into the facsimile image data for the Traditional fax. However, Patel does not disclose nor suggest that the Traditional fax transmits the facsimile image data to the Workstation via the Gateway, which can convert the facsimile image data into the image file and convert the converted image file and the reception result including the telephone number and the reception date into the e-mail data in MIME format.

In contrast, in the paragraph "Binary file transfer" at page 66, col. 2 to page 67, col. 1 of Patel states "the limitation here is that only a rasterized image of the document can be transmitted, even to fax-card-enable personal computers." That is, it appears that facsimile image data from the Traditional fax is transmitted in Patel without being converted into an image file or e-mail data in MIME format. Also, the conversion features of the claimed invention involves a "reception date". Patel only shows "Date of creation" in Fig. 6, but never discloses or suggests "the reception date of the facsimile image data" of the claimed invention.

Patel also discloses in Figs. 5 and 6 that when a PC with BFT support transmits data in BFT format to the Gateway, the Gateway transmits the data in e-mail format (see page 67, col. 2 to page 68, col. 1). However, as apparent from Fig. 6, the BFT header does not include the reception result including the telephone number of the transmitting source and the reception date

67408 v1

Serial No. 09/123,145

-8-

Docket No. 1232-4458

of the facsimile image data of the claimed invention, but only includes the e-mail address and the creation data. The Gateway only decapsulates the BFT message and uses the e-mail address in the BFT header.

Thus, Patel gives no hint or suggestion to convert the image file and the reception result into the e-mail data in MIME format, where the image file is one part and the reception result is another part. Therefore, Patel cannot accomplish the effect of the present invention, especially, causing the destination to recognize the reception result including the telephone number and the reception date.

Accordingly, Yamada, Wada, and Patel (taken alone or in combination) fail to disclose or suggest to the features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

67408 v1

Serial No. 09/123,145

-9-

Docket No. 1232-4458

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4458.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4458.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: 1/5/06By: John A. Harroun

John A. Harroun  
Registration No. 46,339  
(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

**Correspondence Address:**

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101